

From: David.J.Thomas, MSCE, "P.E." <balallan01@earthlink.net>
To: wtc@NIST.GOV
Cc: dlowe@NIST.GOV
Subject: WTC Draft Final Report Comment Form for Report: NCSTAR 1

Information Submitted on: 6/29/2005.

Name : David J. Thomas, MSCE, P.E.
Affiliation : none (public comment)
Email Address : balallan01@earthlink.net
Phone : 301-424-3648
Report Number : NCSTAR 1
Page Number : 197-98
Paragraph : Section 9.1 Building Standards and Codes: Who is In Charge? (Entire Section)
Comment : Delete Section 9.1 from report.
Comment Reason : This section deals with state and local code enforcement, which was not a consideration in the WTC case, since PANYNJ was both the authority having jurisdiction and the owner of the facility. The condition of being simultaneously the owner, builder, reviewer, and inspector of the facilities in question does not obtain in most jurisdictions in the U.S. Where independent review and independent inspection are not part of the equation, generalized comments regarding the necessity of code enforcement, based on national model codes, by local and state building and fire officials are irrelevant to the cases of WTC 1,2,7. These generic comments should be struck from the report as not being part of the findings, since they do not pertain to the WTC. The NYC code, which was used by PANYNJ to make decisions regarding many aspects of the WTC facilities, was not then and still is not a national code, and was not fully based on any of the national model codes. NYC is still at this date moving to adopt documents based on national model codes. The arms-length condition that normally obtains in review and inspection did not obtain in the case of the WTC. No lessons about the state of regular review and inspection by state and local code authorities can be drawn from the information in this report. NIST has no information in this report about code review and enforcement in other than the WTC. Section 9.1 violates the charge of the report.

Revision Suggestion : Inclusion of generic statements not based on the specific conditions of the WTC facilities does a real disservice to those named in such generic statements. There are no facts or items in this report that they can challenge, because none of them have been responsible at any time for the WTC facilities, or for anything like the PANYNJ arrangement. NIST has no basis for making generic statements about code enforcement on the basis of this report. Comparative statements made in the report must cite specific issues found in actual US jurisdictions. Section 9.1 does not do this, and should be removed in its entirety.

2005 WTC Report Comment Application 1.0, dlowe@nist.gov, rev. 6/21/2005

In

Page 1 of 1

From: David.J.Thomas, MSCE, "P.E." <david.thomas@fairfaxcounty.gov>
To: wtc@nist.gov
Cc: dlowe@nist.gov
Subject: WTC Draft Final Report Comment Form for Report: NCSTAR 1

Information Submitted on: 7/26/2005.

Name : David J.Thomas, MSCE, P.E.
Affiliation : Fairfax County Fire Prevention Division
Email Address : david.thomas@fairfaxcounty.gov
Phone : 703-246-4819
Report Number : NCSTAR 1
Page Number : 209

Paragraph : Under Recommendation 13, lines 8,9:

"Pre-installed dedicated firefighter telephone systems in buildings are of limited use and effectiveness, and their installation is not encouraged."

Comment : This statement is untrue in terms of the evidence presented in NIST NCSTAR 1-8, WTC Investigation.

On page 10 of NIST NCSTAR 1-8, you state: "The Warden phones did not work, and attempts to use the wire line phone to upstairs were unsuccessful."

This makes no mention of the firefighters phones, and whether or not they functioned on the levels below that of impact. In fact, if your stairwells had remained intact, the firefighters phones even to the upper levels might have been of value. At present, you have no evidence that radio communications can replace firefighters phones, and your statement under Recommendation 13 should be modified or removed. All evidence that you have shown in this series of reports indicates that there are still severe problems with radios even where assisted by repeaters, and those problems have not been solved. Hence to make a blanket statement to discourage firefighters phones maintained within protected fire-resistive enclosures is wrong, and this sentence should be corrected.

Comment Reason : Evidence both internal and external to the report indicates that this sentence is untrue.

Revision Suggestion : Remove sentence from report.

2005 WTC Report Comment Application 1.0, dlowe@nist.gov, rev. 6/21/2005